

REMARKS

1. Applicant thanks the Examiner for the Examiner's comments which have greatly assisted Applicant in responding.

5

2. **Claim Objections.**

The cited Claims have been amended to remedy the insufficient antecedent basis. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the Claims objections.

10

3. **35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph.**

Claim 1 is rejected as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

15

(i) Specifically, the Examiner cited the phrase, "initiating said first wireless signal to said second message-indicating device; wherein in response to said first signal, said indicator of said first device and said alarm of said second device activate to alert the user" as not being disclosed by the specification.

20

Applicant respectfully traverses.

On page 10, lines 1-7, illustratively, the Specification teaches the user may indicate wish to register the MWID device for use with a certain number or multiple phone numbers. The Specification explicitly teaches multiple devices ("a first message-indicating device" and "a second message-indicating device") may be associated with a single telephone number (a first wireless signal).

25

30

Applicant has just shown how the claimed subject matter is described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

- 5 Accordingly, Applicant respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph.

- (ii) The Examiner also put forth the argument that the specification did not disclose "[sic] in response to the first signal, (both) indicator of the first device and the alarm of
10 the second device are activated.

Applicant respectfully traverses.

- Applicant points out that on page 10, lines 13-14, the specification teaches each MWID
15 ("a first message-indicating device" and "a second message-indicating device") may be registered and configured separately to alert a user to different communication statuses ("said indicator of said first device and said alarm of said second device activate to alert the user").

- 20 Applicant has just shown how the claimed subject matter is described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

- Accordingly, Applicant respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection
25 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph.

4. 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

- Claims 1-3, 5, 8, 9, 12-15, 17, 19-21, 24, and 31 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a)
30 as being unpatentable over Amin *et al.* (US6,630,883) (hereinafter "Amin"), and in view

of Neustein (US6,418,305) (hereinafter "Neustein"), and further in view of Beyda *et al.* (US6,556,666) (hereinafter "Beyda").

Applicant respectfully traverses.

5

Regarding Claim 1, and regarding the claimed limitation, "registering said second message-indicating device for activation in response to receipt of one of multiple types of communications;" by the Examiner's own admission, Amin failed to teach such limitation.

10

The Examiner took Official Notice that "registering a device with a service provider (e.g. a telephone company) at any time or in response to any event" is old and well known to one skilled in the art.

15

Applicant respectfully points out that the Examiner's interpretation of the claim language is incorrect. The Examiner appears to interpret the registering said second message-indicating device **in response to any event**. That is, the Examiner interprets the act of registering as a response to any event.

20

However, Applicant respectfully points out that the claim language states clearly (emphasis added), "registering said second message-indicating device **for activation in response to** receipt of one of multiple types of communications;". That is, the user registers and configures the MWID to be activated in a certain way in response to receipt of a communication.

25

Further, the Examiner underlines his (erroneous) interpretation when the Examiner shows motivation. The Examiner's position is that it would have been obvious to modify the system of Amin "to support the system users conveniences of registering the message-indication device at any time." This showing of motivation is improper because user conveniences to register the device at any time does not motivate registering the device for an activation in response to a receipt of a communication.

30

Therefore, because it is shown that the Examiner incorrectly read the claimed limitation, the rejection is improper. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

5

Because this limitation is cited in each dependent claim and because the rejection that is directed to this limitation of each dependent claim is the same, it follows that the rejection of each independent claim is improper.

10 None of the other prior art alone or in combination add anything of substance towards this feature.

Accordingly, the independent Claims and, hence, the respective dependent Claims, are in condition for allowance because none of the prior art, alone or in combination, teach,
15 suggest, or render obvious the present invention as claimed. Simply put, the application is allowable because it meets the conditions for allowance set forth by the applicable Patent Laws, Patent Office Rules, and controlling Case Law.

5. It should be appreciated that Applicant has elected to amend the Claims solely
20 for the purpose of expediting the patent application process in a manner consistent with the PTO's Patent Business Goals, 65 Fed. Reg. 54603 (9/8/00). In making such amendment, Applicant has not and does not in any way narrow the scope of protection to which Applicant considers the invention herein to be entitled. Rather, Applicant reserves Applicant's right to pursue such protection at a later point in time and merely
25 seeks to pursue protection for the subject matter presented in this submission.

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, Applicant considers the present invention to be distinguished
5 from the art of record. Accordingly, Applicant earnestly solicits the Examiner's
withdrawal of the objections and rejections raised in the above referenced Office Action,
such that a Notice of Allowance is forwarded to Applicant, and the present application is
therefore allowed to issue as a United States patent. The Examiner is invited to call to
10 discuss the response.

Respectfully Submitted,



Michael A. Glenn

Reg. No. 30,176

Customer No. 22862